

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 2

July 10, 2018

136 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Hirschfeld v. Machinist (Order), 329 C 913	3
Puente v. Progressive Northwestern Ins. Co. (Order), 329 C 913	3
State v. Bagnaschi (Order), 329 C 912	2
State v. Brown (Order), 329 C 913	3
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	5

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

DAB Three, LLC v. LandAmerica Financial Group, Inc., 183 CA 307	109A
<i>Contracts; whether trial court properly dismissed claim on basis of lack of subject matter jurisdiction where defendant insurance broker previously had been granted discharge in bankruptcy and plaintiff did not make any claim for liability against any insurer of broker; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment for defendant broker on basis of counsel's representation that defendant broker had changed its name and, thus, no longer existed; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment as to defendant agents who were not parties to contract at issue.</i>	
Speer v. Dept. of Agriculture, 183 CA 298	100A
<i>Administrative appeal; appeal of animal disposal orders pursuant to statute (§ 22-538); claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment of nonsuit; whether plaintiff established that good cause of action existed at time judgment of nonsuit was rendered and that plaintiff was prevented from prosecuting action by mistake, accident or other reasonable cause; whether trial court, in denying motion to open, improperly relied solely on plaintiff's failure to be physically present for pretrial conference pursuant to rule of practice pertaining to pretrial conferences (§ 14-13); whether motion to open satisfied requirements of statute (§ 52-212) governing motions to open and applicable rule of practice (§ 17-43).</i>	
Starble v. Inland Wetlands Commission, 183 CA 280	82A
<i>Administrative appeal; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that requirement of presenting feasible and prudent alternatives under statute (§ 22a-41 [a] [2] and [b] [2]), and applicable regulation (§ 7.5) of inland wetlands commission was directory rather than mandatory; whether trial court improperly applied substantial evidence test to review record of proceedings before commission where commission stated reasons for approving decision and supported its decision with explicit findings.</i>	
Tala E. H. v. Syed I., 183 CA 224	26A
<i>Civil protection order; unpreserved claim that manner in which trial court conducted hearing on continuance of protective order constituted judicial misconduct and bias; whether defendant demonstrated that trial court exhibited bias against him and was guilty of judicial misconduct that affected integrity of proceeding and denied him fair trial; whether trial court misapprehend facts or abuse its discretion by continuing protective order for six months; whether defendant's actions constituted stalking under applicable statute (§ 46b-15 [a]); claim that trial court's consideration of evidence of defendant's placement of certain security cameras and tracking device was improper; whether trial court's erroneous finding that defendant went to home of plaintiff's aunt was harmless.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Webster Bank, N.A. v. Frasca, 183 CA 249	51A
<i>Foreclosure; motion for deficiency judgment; whether trial court committed plain error in failing to consider certain property valuations in plaintiff's appraisal report; whether plaintiff presented sufficient evidence for court to determine value of property on date title vested; whether plaintiff's appraisal report was unreliable; whether plaintiff demonstrated that claimed error was both so clear and harmful that failure to reverse judgment would result in manifest injustice; whether trial court committed plain error in imposing preponderance of evidence standard of proof under statute (§ 49-14) instead of probable cause standard of proof; whether trial court committed plain error in making certain comments on record during hearing; whether certain of trial court's comments demonstrated hostility toward plaintiff or were manifestation of bias; whether trial court's remarks throughout hearing referencing knowledge derived from extrajudicial sources were relied on by court in analytical decision-making process in denying motion for deficiency judgment; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting and relying on certain evidence submitted during hearing; whether defendant presented ample evidence for court to determine that plaintiff failed to satisfy burden of demonstrating fair market value of property as of date title vested in plaintiff; whether court's decision to find no credible valuation on basis of plaintiff's failure to meet burden was within reasonable bounds of discretion; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motion for protective order in response to notice of deposition.</i>	
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Lorson, 183 CA 200	2A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court's determination that plaintiff proved its prima facie case was clearly erroneous; claim that plaintiff had burden to prove compliance with United States Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations that pertained to home mortgage foreclosure actions as condition precedent to bringing foreclosure action; whether defendants had affirmative duty to plead noncompliance with regulations as special defense; whether trial court correctly determined that defendants failed to prove their special defense of equitable estoppel; claim that trial court's finding that defendants failed to prove special defense of unclean hands was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Volume 183 Cumulative Table of Cases	123A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.